

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/065,848	LASKARIS ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:

Status of Application: After-final before a NOA

(1) Ex. Tiffany A. Fetzner. (3) _____.

(2) Attorney Patrick S. Yoder Reg. no. 37,479. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 24 March 2005

Time: 3:30pm-5pm

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims 1-23

Claims discussed:

Claim 1

Prior art documents discussed:

Chari et al., US patent 5,307,039 and Byrne et al., US patent 6,211,676 B1,

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative in an effort to clarify and hopefully resolve via a clarifying amendment the features claimed by applicant, as opposed to the features argued in the MArch 18th 2005 response. No resolution resulted and the attorney requested an advisory action of each of the examiner's concerns. The advisory action accompanies this response. The examiner suggested that some problems may be resolved by clarification of applicant's claim terminology, or exchanging terminology causing confusion with equivalent, wording that better clarifies the actual invention. Applicant's representative indicated an Advisory was needed prior to any correction by applicant. The examiner agreed but noted that the finality of the last office action stands and is being maintained by the examiner, in view of what the finally rejected claims actually recite and require, as opposed to limitations argued but not clearly recited in applicant's claims..

Ex. Tiffany A. Tegner
AU2859
(571) 272-224